DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 104 462 JC 750 249

AUTHOR South, James D.; And Others
TITLE The Relationship of Teacher Role Orientation and Perceived Teaching Effectiveness.
PUB DATE 31 Mar 75
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, D. C., March 31-April 3, 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; *Effective Teaching; *Faculty Evaluation; Grade Point Average; Grading; *Identification (Psychological); *Junior Colleges; Role Perception; *Student Attitudes; Student Characteristics; Student Participation; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Characteristics; Women Teachers
IDENTIFIERS *Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to test the following hypotheses: (1) that student-centered teachers are perceived by their students to be more effective than subject-centered teachers, and (2) that the first hypothesis will hold true regardless of certain characteristics of students and faculty. Questionnaires designed to ascertain role-orientation were sent to 627 faculty members at five Pennsylvania community colleges in fall 1973; 278 (44 percent) responded. In addition, questionnaires designed to measure teaching effectiveness were sent to members of one class of each instructor sampled; of 27,283 students sampled, 12,396 (45 percent) responded. Results supported the first hypothesis, but failed to support the second; the relationship between perceived teaching effectiveness and role-orientation was strongly influenced by the student's expected course grade. Furthermore, faculty in the humanities, fine arts, and in education were seen to be more effective than faculty in other areas, whereas faculty in the social and behavioral sciences were seen to be less effective. Female teachers were perceived more effective than their male counterparts. Students with high GPA's and high course grade expectations tended to rate their instructors more highly than students with low GPA's and low grade expectations. (DC)

ED104462

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE RELATIONSHIP OF TEACHER ROLE ORIENTATION AND PERCEIVED TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

James D. South and Malcolm Hill
The Pennsylvania State University

and

James L. Morrison
The University of North Carolina

Presented

at

The 1975 Annual Meeting of the American
Educational Research Association

Washington, D.C.

March 31 - April 3

JC 750 249

THE RELATIONSHIP OF ROLE ORIENTATION AND
PERCEIVED TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

The community college has come to occupy an important position in the American educational structure. From its inception there have been claims of its uniqueness, its special mission, and its particular concern with student development. Historically, the comprehensive public community college has been catagorized as serving a diversity of purposes for a varied student population with a heterogeneous faculty. (Medsker and Tillery, 1971; Monroe, 1972.) The institution has steadfastly held to the primacy of its teaching function. Congruently, the community college has been concerned with the problem of effective teaching and with faculty who are committed to student development. Much of the literature of the community college movement assumes that student-oriented teachers are the most effective teachers in the community college setting. (O'Banion, 1972; Roy, 1973; McKeefery, 1959; Pyle, 1968; Garrison, 1966.) The purpose of this study is to theoretically and empirically explore this assumption.

Theoretical Considerations

There has been a good deal of research on the relationship of a sense of competence to academic achievement, as well as the relationship of a sense of competence to self-concept. (Brookover and Thomas, 1964; Rosen, et al, 1960). Symbolic interactionists hold that the individual's sense of self-worth, self-efficacy, and self-concept are products of interaction with significant others. (Mead, 1934; McKinney, 1970). In the classroom setting, teachers often act as significant others. If teachers demonstrate that they accept the individual where he is and want to assist in his development, the

probability that the teacher will become a significant other is increased. Since the student-oriented teacher is one who is more sensitive to the personal and social needs of the student, particularly in contrast to the subject-centered teacher (who is interested largely in presentation of subject matter) it would be expected that the student-centered teacher would be perceived as more effective by students in the community college setting. This relationship forms the basic hypothesis of the study. Since the student-centered teacher is one who is more sensitive to the personal and social needs of the student and who uses the student as a curricular referent, it would be expected that teachers with a high degree of this orientation would be preceived as more effective by students in the community college setting than teachers who have a low degree of this orientation or who are subject-centered, i.e., who use the subject as the curricular referent. Therefore, we hypothesize the following:

1. There is a relationship between instructor role orientation and instructor effectiveness as perceived by community college students. Specifically, the more student-centered the role orientation of the instructor, the greater the perceived effectiveness.

2. This relationship will hold irrespective of the influence of the following rival explanatory variables:

    age of teacher
    teaching experiences of teacher
    teacher teaching area
    degree level of teacher
    teacher's academic rank
    student major
    student expected course grade
    student GPA
    student age

Methodological Considerations

In order to examine empirically the variables under consideration, two questionnaires were constructed, one for faculty and one for students. The faculty questionnaire items relating to degree level, teaching area,

rank, age, sex and teacher role orientation. Morrison (1972) in an earlier study developed twelve item indicators of role orientation. Eight items were attributed a priori to the subject centered pole of this dimension and four items were attributed to the student-centered pole. He found that not all items were empirically in the same dimension, thus bringing into question the unidimensionality of the variable. For this reason, we incorporated Morrison's item indicators and developed eight additional items (see Table 1). The criteria for constructing the items were drawn from the literature on student- and subject-oriented teaching, concepts which revolve around using the student or the subject as the referent for course and curricular organization.

The student questionnaire was adapted from one developed at the Harrisburg (Pennsylvania) Area Community College. As the reader may note from an examination of Table 2, perceived teaching effectiveness items concern such areas as the instructor's command of subject matter, classroom approach, and interaction pattern. Each of the fourteen items serves as a stimulus for respondents to consider in their overall evaluation of teaching effectiveness, items15.

The primary modification to the student questionnaire was the inclusion of items relating to the student's major, expected course grade, grade point average (GPA), and age. Many authorities argue the validity of student evaluation of teaching effectiveness (Lee, 1967; Kelley and Wilber, 1970; Erickson, 1970; Miller, 1972; Sockloff, 1973; Centra, 1973; and McKeachie, 1973.) The findings of investigators exploring the assumption that student judgments of teaching effectiveness are unaffected by student characteristics, characteristics of the class or course, and instructor characteristics are mixed. For example, although Kent (1966)

found that class size, rater's sex, rater's GPA, and teacher's sex do not seem to affect ratings, he found that there was a relationship between rater's class and teacher's rank. Granzin and Painter (1973) reported no significant differences between student's sex, GPA, age or whether the course was in his major. They did find, however, that electives receive slightly higher ratings than required courses and that there is a relationship of evaluations with anticipated grade. McKeachie (1973) reviewed a number of studies in this area and reported that class size, required versus elective courses, student age, sex, and class rank, and instructor teaching experience were not related to student ratings. Some studies he reviewed, however, report a relationship between student ratings and instructor's age, sex, and degree level. Such findings indicate that third variables may be related to perceived teaching effectiveness and therefore may affect the relationship of role orientation to perceived teaching effectiveness. We therefore included items on both questionnaires which concerned relevant student and instructor characteristics. The faculty questionnaire, after being pretested in a pilot study, was distributed along with the student questionnaire in the Fall of 1973 in five Pennsylvania Community colleges selected in such a fashion as to provide variability along the dimensions of community setting and size. One class of each instructor in the sample was randomly selected for inclusion in the student sample. This enabled us to link the score for perceived teaching effectiveness of each teacher with his role orientation score.

Out of 627 questionnaires distributed to faculty, 278 were returned (44% response). Out of 27,283 questionnaires distributed to students, 12,396 were returned (45% response). Due to the nature of the sample selection procedure and the response rate, the randomness of the sample can be questioned. However, since the stress in this study is the examination of the relationships between theoretically relevant variables, randomness is not a particularly crucial factor. One should note, however, that when the sample was compared with other community college faculty samples with respect to such indicators as age, degree held, socioeconomic background, and percentage of teachers with public school teaching experience, this sample is fairly close to the mean in all cases. Therefore, even though technically the sample was not a random one, it appears to approximate other samples of community college faculties.

Inspection of the data generated by the perceived teaching effectiveness scale reveals that students generally perceive their instructors positively. This is evident when we examine the frequency distribution of the responses to the teaching effectiveness scale items (see Table 3). For the response set taken as a whole, we find that the three measures of central tendency are well above the midpoint of the five point rating scale. For example, the mean score is 4.14, the mode 5.00, and the median 4.30. As may be seen in Table 3 , the first 14 items of the perceived teaching effectiveness scale focus on specific features of the instructor's approach. Taken together these 14 items comprise the perceived teaching effectiveness scale. Each item indicates the general tendency of students to give fairly strong positive ratings to instructors (Item 15) . Item 15 represents an overall evaluation of the faculty member's effectiveness.

Student response to Item 15 was much like that to the other 14 items, markedly positive. The frequency of low ratings on all 15 items tends to be noteably low.

Teaching effectiveness scores were developed for each faculty member through the use of factor analysis. Inspection of the factor loadings indicated the presence of one principle factor which we have designated perceived teaching effectiveness. The presence of a second factor was also indicated but its prominence as judged by the number of items and their factor weights was considerably less pronounced than factor one. In developing scale scores for perceived teaching effectiveness all items were included.[1]

Role orientation was measured by a composite scale comprised of twenty items intended to probe different aspects of this variable. These items were subjected to a principal-components factor analysis which revealed one principal factor which we designated student-orientation. The data indicates the presence of other factors besides the one labelled student-orientation. However, when compared to this first factor, the others emerge as relatively weak. The emergence of one principal factor is somewhat surprising, particularly in view of Morrison's (1972) study in which factor analysis of a smaller number of similar items seemed to produce two dominant factors. This could not be a clear decision because of the small number of items in the second factor (three out of twelve items).

---

[1]Including items not clearly in the first factor for the development of scale scores was considered justified because those items had such low first factor loadings that they would not significantly influence the resulting scale scores out of proportion to their apparent contribution to that dimension.

Scale scores for role orientation were developed for each faculty member through the use of factor analysis. These scores indicate that in general faculty are student-oriented. For example, in a maximum possible range of scores from 1 through 6, the mean score for all 278 faculty members in our sample was 4.17; the [illegible] was 4.62, and the median was 4.20. This data is congruent with other research reported in the literature which concludes that community college faculty generally tend to be student-oriented.

DATA ANALYSIS

The Relationship Between Role Orientation and Perceived Teaching Effectiveness

The primary hypothesis in this study is that faculty members who exhibit a high level of student-centeredness in their role orientation are more likely to be perceived by their students as effective teachers. To test this hypothesis we used a Pearson product moment correlation to measure the association between the two variables. The coefficient of correlation between perceived teaching effectiveness and role orientation was .15, which is significant at the .05 level. This finding indicates support for our principle hypothesis. Further support for this hypothesis may be noted in Table 4. It was found that six of the 14 items comprising the perceived teaching effectiveness scale exhibited significant correlations with role orientation at the .05 level or better. Item 15, which as we indicated before represents an overall rating of the instructor, correlated with role orientation with a coefficient of .20. This is significant at the .01 level.

As may be noted in Table 4, four of the six items of the perceived teaching effectiveness scale which were significantly related to role

orientation (items 2,3,8 and 9) are directed at the relationship between student and teacher.[1] Affective in nature, each has to do with the instructor's attitude as perceived by the student. This point is particularly stressed in item two which asks whether the instructor is sensitive to the student's feelings and problems. The significance of the correlation of this item is the strongest of all items. (.001). Of the two other item indicators which exhibited significant correlations with role orientation (items 6, 13), one has to do with the instructor's stimulation of thinking; the other with his subject matter competency. This latter finding warrants some specific attention. The insight which students have and their desire for an education may combine to cause them to require subject matter competency from those they perceive as effective. As noted earlier, it may be argued that students know when they have been taught well. These findings suggest that if teachers do not seem to know their material, students will not likely see them as good instructors. Thus, as Blocker (1965) has suggested, faculty must appear knowledgeable in order to be perceived as effective teachers in the community college.

On the basis of these results, there is empirical support for our claim that teaching effectiveness, as evaluated by students, is associated with the role orientation of faculty. To be specific, the evidence here suggests a positive relationship between perceived teaching effectiveness and a student-centered role orientation on the part of faculty.

---

[1] Item 15, "Considering everything, how would you rate this instructor," was not used in developing the perceived teaching effectiveness score as it is regarded as a summary indicator.

The Relationship Between Role Orientation and Perceived Teaching Effectiveness After Controlling for Faculty and Student Background Factors

The second hypothesis of this research claimed that the relationship between perceived teaching effectiveness and role orientation would hold regardless of the influence of third variables, in this case, the background characteristics of faculty and students. Statistically, the assertion implicit in this hypothesis is that the relationship existing between the two variables will not diminish when we control for the effects of third variables. To test this hypothesis we used a partial correlational analysis whereby we removed the effects of certain background characteristics of faculty and students on the relationship between perceived teaching effectiveness and student role orientation. The results, as shown in Table 5, indicate that such faculty characteristics as degree level, teaching area, rank, age, and sex have no appreciable influence on the relationship between perceived teaching effectiveness and role orientation. In fact, none of these items accounts for more than 2 percent of the variance from the zero order correlation, i.e., from the original correlation. Student background characteristics dealt with in our analysis include (1) whether the course is in the student's major, (2) the expected course grade, (3) the student's GPA , and (4) the student's age. In examining these, we find that only one has any effect on the relationship between perceived teaching effectiveness and role orientation. However, this one characteristic has considerable effect. Specifically, we find that when we control for the influence of the expected course grade the association between perceived teaching effectiveness and role orientation diminishes from an original coefficient of .15 to a coefficient of .08. This represents a reduction in the relationship by about 45 percent.

On the basis of these results, it would appear that the relationship between perceived teaching effectiveness and role orientation is strongly influenced by the grade which the student expects. Therefore, for this third variable, the hypothesis is not supported; for the other third variables, the hypotheses were supported.

Because of this finding, we decided to run certain student and faculty background characteristics against perceived teaching effectiveness. Table 6 presents the results of this analysis. There we see that certain characteristics do influence the instructor's perceived teaching effectiveness. We may note, for example, that in some instances the area in which a faculty member teaches influences his perceived effectiveness. Specifically, faculty in the humanities and fine arts and in education are perceived by their students as being more effective than other faculty. By comparison, faculty who teach in the behavioral and social sciences appear to be significantly low on effectiveness as compared with other faculty members. Of the other background characteristics, only sex was found to be significantly correlated with perceived teaching effectiveness. In this instance it was found that female faculty tend to be perceived as more effective teachers than their male counterparts.

With respect to the relationship of student background characteristics on perceived teaching effectiveness, we find that two student characteristics, expected course grade and GPA, are significantly related to perceived teaching effectiveness. The degree of association was quite pronounced, being .47 for expected course grade and .37 for GPA. Both items were significant at the .01 level. No association was found between the other two characteristics, course in student's major and age, and perceived teaching effectiveness.

It appears that certain background characteristics of both faculty and students influence perceived teaching effectiveness. For faculty, such characteristics include specific teaching areas and the sex of the individual. For students, the grade they expect in the course and their GPA's affect their perception of teaching effectiveness.

Discussion

Two specific limitations should be recognized in considering the results of this study. First, the findings and the interpretations are limited to the populations of the five institutions studied. Because the population was not randomly selected from the total population of community colleges it cannot be claimed to be truly representative. Secondly, the use of subjective student perspectives is a limitation. No claim is advanced that these students actually experienced effective teaching or that they learned more from those they perceived as more effective. To advance such notions would involve research considerably beyond the scope of this study.

In spite of such limitations, the results of this study support our contention that there is a relationship between the instructor's role orientation and students' perception of the instructor's teaching effectiveness. Indeed, we can generally conclude that the more student-centered an instructor is, the more likely it is that he will be perceived as effective.

The impact of certain characteristics on perceived teaching effectiveness as revealed in this study warrants further explanation. It seems plausible that faculty whose teaching area is education will be more aware of those approaches that enhance teaching effectiveness. It also seems likely that faculty in education have considerable professional

experience with educational techniques which promote teaching effectiveness. As such, they may well have an advantage over faculty in other areas. We think that this may in part explain why teachers in education are more prone than other faculty to be seen as effective teachers. With respect to the significant tendency of faculty in the humanities and fine arts to evidence teaching effectiveness, our explanation is somewhat more speculative. It may be, as Gaff and Wilson (1971) suggest, that the less codified the subject area, the more likely the instructor is to use wide-ranging discursive styles of teaching. Likewise, it may be that because these teaching areas often are concerned with feelings and use faculty who bring a personal dramatic approach to the teaching situation, students become more caught up in their classes and, as a consequence, sense that their instructors are more effective. We suspect that such teaching styles may appeal to a broader range of students than the highly focused and structured teaching styles that are common to highly codified fields. If this is so, this appeal may be expressed by students as being more effective. We are hard pressed to explain the low level of teaching effectiveness ascribed to faculty in the social and behavioral sciences. We suspect that it has something to do with the nature of these disciplines. These are frequently referred to as the "soft" sciences which suggests that both the subject matter and the various substantive issues dealt with lack precision and clarity. Many issues in these fields may be open to interpretation; others may rely on the formulation of social policy for their expression. What we are suggesting is that the social and behavioral sciences include many vague and ill-defined areas. As such they may present the student with as many unanswered questions as answered ones. It may be that this state of affairs is interpreted by students

as a weakness in the teacher rather than as a characteristic of the discipline. If this is the case, it may account for the low level of teaching effectiveness ascribed to these faculty members. Finally, with respect to faculty characteristics, our data indicates that female faculty tend to be viewed as more effective than males. Although the study did not develop a definite explanation for this, it may result from the inclination of students to view women as more sensitive and more attuned to affective concerns than men. It may be that such affect and concern are interpreted as teaching effectiveness.

Two other characteristics which tend to be associated with perceived effectiveness are GPA . and expected course grade. These findings may be related to achievement-oriented behavior which the theoretical model held as being tied to motivation; to the leniency tendency often times associated with student evaluation; and to the nature of the "new" student.

As has been noted, the community college student is often one who has experienced failure. It is not surprising then to discover that the higher the student's GPA . and the higher he expects his course grade to be, the more likely it is for him to positively regard the teaching of his instructor. In essence, the student may well be reacting to those who appear to have demonstrated an interest in his overall development; he may view the instructor's reward of his own learning efforts as teaching effectiveness. These two relationships may also obtain because of a tendency to be lenient. The community college student may generally be disposed to positively evaluating his instructors. His society has inculcated in him a respect for his elders, especially those who are educated. Thus he is disposed to favorably react to his instructors. From these results it is not possible to account definitely for a given evaluation because

the students were not asked what it is that causes them to rate an instructor in a given fashion.

For the advocates of student evaluation of teachers, these findings which are based on more than 12,000 student responses should give pause for reflection. These advocates would maintain that students evaluate instructors in a manner uninhibited by other considerations. The findings of this study contradict that view. They may, consequently, provide some basis for an argument about the applicability of this technique of evaluating teaching effectiveness.

The implications of this study tend to fall into two categories: implications for future research and implications for the community college.

One of the implications for future research concerns the nature of the relationship between instructors and students. It focuses on the question of whether the relationship between perceived teaching effectiveness and role orientation as found in this study would hold in other settings. In other words, do students in four year colleges and universities respond to student-oriented teachers in the same way that community college students do?

The matter of the dimensionality of role orientation could also provide the focus for future research. One aspect of this research would be to develop a theoretical basis for the dimensionality of role orientation, and another aspect would be to devise a measure of dimensionality. The findings of this research and that of Morrison (1969, 1973) raise questions as to whether role orientation for community college instructors is a unidimensional phenomenon. This would appear to deserve further study.

This study has investigated the relationship between role orientation

and perceived teaching effectiveness. It would be worthwhile to examine the relationship between role orientation and actual teaching effectiveness in the sense of student learning. This would, of course, necessitate removing such psychological and sociological variables as would affect student learning from the relationship. However, it would be a worthwhile task for a more sophisticated study.

It would also be of value to explore more systematically the question of whether those variables affecting student perception could be controlled. This question has particular relevance in those instances where student evaluation of instructors is used for such decisions as promotion, tenure, salary increments, etc. Increasingly, student evaluation does play a role in faculty development. Thus, it is crucial that assurance be obtained that student evaluation is a valid measure of teaching effectiveness. An implication of this study is that caution must be used with student evaluation.

This study also has implications for the community college. Irrespective of the limitations we have noted, the findings of this study support and reiterate a basic premise of the community college. Specifically, that the student-oriented instructor is likely to be perceived by students as being effective in meeting their expectations for a teacher.

In sum, the findings of this study that (a) role orientation is related to perceived teaching effectiveness, and (b) students generally rate faculty highly implies that the various community college students, including the "new" student, can be "reached" and affected by faculty.

TABLE 1

Items Attributed to the Role Orientation Dimension

Items Attributed to Subject Pole	Items Attributed to Student Pole
Research in one's own academic field takes precedence over development of new courses.	Course outlines should be determined after consultation with students who are taking the course.
It is more important for faculty to keep abreast with their field than to become engaged in counseling.	Faculty members should be available to students in their homes as well as on campus.
The content and organization of introductory courses should be determined by the nature of one's academic discipline.	A primary responsibility of the faculty should be to help students meet their individual needs and become responsible citizens.
Students should not serve on curriculum committees.	Faculty have an obligation to serve as personal role models for students.
Term papers are better teaching techniques than field experiences.	Courses within each academic area should be tailored to the needs of the specific students in those courses.
Faculty should maintain a uniform grading standard of academic achievement in all classes.	Organization and content of courses is more dependent on student's ability, interest and program than on materials published in academic journals and textbooks.
When an instructor moves from one institution to another, the content and structure of his courses may easily be modified.	Faculty should consider the social and emotional development of students as important as their academic development.
Faculty should assume responsibility for only the academic development of their students.	Serving as an advisor to a student organization should be taken account of in tenure and promotion considerations.
Faculty should not be expected to to sponsor student organizations.	The quality of faculty member's teaching performance should be the most important determinant of his professional status.
	Manual and physical skills development are as important to a person's growth as is intellectual development.
	Faculty should not be expected to maintain in all classes standards comparable to those of the lower division of the university.

TABLE 2

Items Attributed to the Perceived Teaching Effectiveness Dimension

Is the instructor actively helpful when you have difficulty?	Does the instructor respect students?
Is the instructor sensitive to student's feelings and problems?	Does the instructor tell students when they have done particularly well?
Does the instructor increase your interest in the subject?	Is the instructor prepared for class?
Does the instructor make students feel free to ask questions, disagree and express their ideas?	Does the instructor distinguish between his opinion and facts?
Is the instructor fair in his dealings with the student?	Are the instructor's directions clear?
Does the instructor display sufficient knowledge of his subject?	Does the instructor stimulate thinking?
Does the instructor clarify the material for the class?	Has the instructor helped you make the material sufficiently relevent to your needs and goals?
	Considering everything how would you rate this instructor?

TABLE 3

Frequency Distribution of Responses to Perceived Teaching Effectiveness Scale[1]

Item	Response Categories[2]					N[3]
	1	2	3	4	5	
1	1.7	4.1	15.2	32.6	46.6	12,748
2	2.5	6.1	18.4	32.8	40.2	12,277
3	5.1	7.0	19.8	29.5	38.5	12,313
4	1.5	3.1	9.4	23.0	63.0	12,319
5	1.4	2.8	10.1	33.1	52.6	12.993
6	1.0	1.5	6.2	20.0	71.3	12,347
7	2.2	5.1	15.3	34.3	43.2	12,338
8	1.3	2.3	9.9	26.8	59.7	12,331
9	2.9	5.7	20.8	33.1	38.4	12,271
10	1.6	2.8	9.6	26.1	60.1	12,341
11	1.8	3.2	13.5	34.0	48.0	12,097
12	1.9	4.2	15.8	35.9	42.1	12,328
13	3.0	4.9	16.4	32.7	43.1	12,316
14	3.7	5.9	18.4	31.7	40.3	12,239
15	1.7	6.9	15.9	34.9	40.6	12,293

[1] The central tendency of the composite scale comprising items 1 through 14 is as follows: mean; 4.14; mode: 5.00; median 4.30.

[2] Responses are expressed in percentages.

[3] N's vary due to the failure of students to answer all items.

TABEE 4

Pearson Product Moment Correlations of Each Item Indicator of Perceived Teaching Effectiveness With Role Orientation

Items	Correlation[a]
1. Is the instructor actively helpful when you have difficulty?	.05
2. Is the instructor sensitive to students feelings and problems?	.22 *
3. Does the instructor increase your interest in the subject?	.19 **
4. Does the instructor make students feel free to ask questions, disagree and express their ideas?	.10
5. Is the instructor fair in his dealings with the student?	.04
6. Does the instructor display sufficient knowledge of his subject?	.19 **
7. Does the instructor clarify the material for the class?	.09
8. Does the instructor respect students?	.13 **
9. Does the instructor tell students when they have done particularly well?	.14 **
10. Is the instructor prepared for class?	.10
11. Does the instructor distinguish between his opinion and facts?	.07
12. Are the instructor's directions clear?	.09
13. Does the instructor stimulate thinking?	.22 *
14. Has the instructor helped you make the material sufficiently relevant to your needs and goals?	.12
15. Considering everything, how would you rate this instructor?	.20 *

[a] Correlations are based on an N of 175. This represents all faculty members for whom there were corresponding evaluations completed by students.

* Significant at the .01 level.

** Significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 5

First Order Partial Correlations Between Role Orientation and Perceived Teaching Effectiveness Controlling for Selected Faculty and Student Characteristics

Characteristic Controlled for	Characteristic related to	First Order Partial Correlation[a]
Degree Level	Faculty	.15 *
Teaching Area		
(a) Hum. & Fine Arts	"	.14 *
(b) Behavioral & Social Sciences	"	.15 *
(c) Education	"	.13 *
(d) Math & Physical Sciences	"	.14 *
(e) Natural Sciences	"	.15 *
(f) Engineering Technology	"	.15 *
(g) Social Service	"	.15 *
(h) Other Occupational	"	.15 *
Rank	"	.15 *
Age	"	.14 *
Course in Major	Student	.14 *
Expected Course Grade	"	.08
GPA	"	.15 *
Age	"	.14 *

[a] The zero order correlation between role orientation and perceived teaching effectiveness is .15 which is significant at the .05 level.

* Significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 6

Correlations of Background Characteristics of Faculty and Students with Perceived Teaching Effectiveness

Background Characteristics	Correlation	Type of Correlation
Faculty[a]		
Degree Level	.04	Pearson
Teaching Area		
(a) Hum. & Fine Arts	.12 *	Biserial
(b) Behavioral & Social Sciences	-.14 *	Biserial
(c) Education	.17 *	Biserial
(d) Math & Physical Sciences	-.02	Biserial
(e) Natural Sciences	-.05	Biserial
(f) Engineering Technology	-.06	Biserial
(g) Social Service	.07	Biserial
(h) Other Occupational	-.05	Biserial
Rank	.07	Pearson
Age	.03	Pearson
Sex	.14 *	Biserial
Student[b]		
Course in major	.08	Biserial
Expected Course Grade	.47 *	Pearson
GPA	.37 *	Pearson
Age	.11	Pearson

[a] Based on an N of 175

[b] Based on an N of 122. Not all campuses in our study provided student background information. As a result, the number of faculty for whom complete student information was available was 122.

* Significant at the .01 level.

REFERENCES

Brookover, W.B. and Thomas , C., Self-concept of ability in school achievement. Sociology of Education, 1964, 37, 271-278.

Centra, J.A. The student as Godfather? The impact of student ratings on academia. In A.L. Sockloff (ed.), Proceedings: Faculty effectiveness as evaluated by students. Phila: Temple University, 1973.

Erickson, S.C. Earning and learning by the hour. In W.H. Morris (Ed.), Effective college teaching. Wash. D.C.: American Council on Education, 1970, 1-37.

Gaff, J.G. Faculty cultures and interdisciplinary studies. Journal of Higher Education, 1971, 42 (3), 186-201.

Garrison, R.H. Professional and philosophical faculty attitudes. Junior College Journal, 1966, 36 (6), 16-19.

Granzin, B. The nature of deference and demeanor. American Anthropologist, 1966, 58, 473-502.

Kelley, W. & Wilbur, L. Teaching in the community junior college. New York: Appleton Century Crofts, 1970.

Lee, C.B.T. Open-door classrooms for open-door colleges. Junior College Journal, 1967, 37 (5), 11-13.

McKeachie, W.J. Correlates of student ratings. In A.L. Sockloff (ed.), Proceedings: Faculty effectiveness as evaluated by students. Phila.: Temple University, 1973.

McKeefery, W.J. Some observations of effective teaching. Collegiate News and Views, 1959, 12 (3), 1-4.

McKinney, J.C. Sociological theory and the process of typification. In J.C. McKinney & E.A. Tiryakian (Eds.), Theoretical sociology: perspectives and development. New York: Appleton-Century crofts, 1970.

Mead, G.H. Mind, self and society. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1934.

Medsker, L. & Tillery, D. Breaking the access barriers. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Miller, R.I. Evaluating faculty performance. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1972.

Monroe, C. Profile of the community college. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1972.

Morrison, J.L. The relationship of socialization experience, role orientation, and the acceptance of the comprehensive community junior college concept by public junior college faculty. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Florida State University, 1969.

Morrison, J.L. Socialization experience, role orientation, and faculty acceptance of the comprehensive community junior college concept. Review of Educational Research, 1972, 42 (4), 573-588.

O'Banion, T. Teachers for tomorrow: Staff development in the community college. Tucson, Ariz.: The University of Arizona Press, 1972.

Pyle, G.B. Teaching and teacher responsibility. Junior College Journal, 1968, 38 (6), 48-54.

Rosen, S., Levinger, G., and Lippitt, D. Desired change in self and others as a function fo resource ownership, Human Relations, 1960, 13, 187-192.

Roy, A.D. What is a student-oriented teacher? Junior College Journal, 1973, 44 (3), 39.

Sockloff, A.L. Instruments for student evaluation of faculty: Ideal and actual. In A.L. Sockloff (Ed.), Proceedings: Faculty effectiveness as evaluated by students. Phila.: Temple University, 1973.

Blocker, C. Are our faculties competent? Junior College Journal, 1965, 36 (4), 12-17.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAY 2 1975

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION